

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27-31 are pending, in which claims 21, 26 and 28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 16, 20, 23-25, 30 and 31 are currently amended. No new matter is introduced.

The Final Office Action mailed June 8, 2010 rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 17, 18, 23, 24 and 30 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* (US 2002/0082044) in view of *Britt et al.* (US 6,424,832, *Britt* hereinafter) and *Berkowitz et al.* (US 7,133,678, *Berkowitz* hereinafter), claims 25, 27 and 29 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Denisson* in view of *Moon* (US 7,295,844) and further in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz*, claims 10-12, 15 and 19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz* and further in view of *Denisson*, claims 3, 10, 13, 14, 20 and 22 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz* and further in view of *Silver* (US 7,162,237), claim 16 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz* and further in view of *Denisson* and *Silver*, and claim 31 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Davenport* in view of *Dougherty* (US 6,831,902) and further in view of *Britt* and *Berkowitz*.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the original specification does not disclose a computer readable medium, as recited in claim 23. The specification discloses a computer as a terminal, and further discloses a computer program used in the invention (see, e.g., paragraphs [0013] and

[0045] of the specification). Because the computer inherently has a storage medium, and the computer program is often stored in a computer readable medium, it is inherent that the specification discloses a computer readable medium. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 is fully supported by and adequately described in the written description of the invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, “wherein the location dependent routing information includes a local call-in number for performing two-stage dialing to establish the connection via a first access point of a first communication network accessible using the local call-in number, and wherein routing is to the other terminal in a second communication network using a second access point of the second communication network via a third communication network comprising an internal communication network of the terminal and the other terminal.” Independent claims 23-25 and 29-31 include similar features in a varying scope.

The Office Action states, “*Britt* discloses wherein said location dependent routing information includes local call-in number to perform two-stage dialing for establishing said connection via an access point accessible at said location of the at least one terminal using a local call-in number for said access point wherein said routing is to at least one other terminal in a second communication network (see col. 2, line 44- col. 3, line 4).” See pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action. Further, in response to the Applicants’ arguments presented in the Amendment filed on April 22, 2010, the Office Action states: “[a]s to applicant’s representative [hereinafter

applicant] arguments that *Britt* only discloses a single network, it is noted that the limitation of calling to a third network is taught by *Berkowitz*” (see page 2 of the Office Action).

Britt discloses that roamer port numbers utilize tow-stage dialing procedures to enable subscribers operating in the same local network to call each other without incurring long distance charges (see col. 2, lines 46-51 of *Britt*). As an example of this feature, *Britt* discloses that, “if a subscriber from Montreal travels to Dallas and registers there, a calling party in Dallas can utilize the roamer port in Dallas to call the Montreal subscriber without incurring long distance charges” (see col. 2, lines 51-55 of *Britt*). Hence, *Britt* discloses a feature that enables making a call by subscribers within the same network, and thus avoids long distance charges, even though the subscribers are from different home networks. Because the feature in *Britt* is to enable a call by subscribers within a single network to avoid long distance charges, it is not desirable for *Britt* to use multiple networks to make a call and incur long distance charges as a result. The feature of calling to a third network in *Berkowitz* cannot be combined with *Britt* because such combination would result in making a call using different networks, thus incurring long distance charges. Hence, *Britt* and *Berkowitz* cannot be properly combined to teach or suggest these features of the independent claims. Further, the other cited references fail to overcome the deficiencies of *Britt* and *Berkowitz*. Therefore, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 23-25 and 29-31.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 23-25 and 29-31, and each of the claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

September 8, 2010
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

Jun S. Ha
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 58508

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9951
Fax (703) 519-9958